

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,112	11/13/2003	George H. Corrigan	10010484-2	7670
7590	11/02/2005	EXAMINER		
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			NGUYEN, LAM S	
Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			2853	
For Comms, CO	80327-2400		2033	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

٨л	/
ĸг	

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/712,112	CORRIGAN, GEORGE H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LAM S. NGUYEN	2853	

	LAM S. NGUYEN	2853				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 17 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, affitice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ster than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 16.07(f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
AMENDMENTS						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further conto (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially re-	ducing or simplifying	ille issues loi			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	·•					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		l be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ls to provide a I).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
13. Other:						

10/21/05

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: First of all, the applicant argued that Bohorquez does not teach or suggest that the signal at positive input of element 16 in FIG. 3 is an offsest voltage. The examiner does not agree with the above assertion. As based on the definition that "offset" is "something that serves to counterbalance or to compensate for something else" (Merrian-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition, page 805), any electrical signal, either discrete or continuous, digital or analog, unipolar or bipolar, that has a voltage value and being used as an input to adjust "something" in order to compensate for "something else" is considered as "an offset voltage". In this case, Bohorquez' control signal, the signal at positive input of element 16 in FIG. 3, inherently has a voltage value and is used as the input of the level shifting circuit 16 to adjust the signal (something) applied to the driver circuit 18, which in turn applies the adjusted voltage to the heater resistor RH (column 3, lines 60-68) in order to compensate for the energy losses in the power and return lines (something else). As a result, Bohorquez' control signal is an offset voltage by definition.

In addition, the applicant also argued that Suzuki uses the power supply to provide the driving pulse signal p, not an offset voltage. However, the main point of Suzuki's teaching is that it cures the Bohorquez's shortcoming of taking the voltage sample directly from the internal power supply path rather than for providing an offset voltage purpose. Moreover, both Bohorquez and Suzuki have a common function/operation that is directly or indirectly sampling the voltage at the power supply, then adjusting the driving energy in accordance to that voltage sample.

Finally, the applicant argued that both Bohorquez and Suzuki do not teach or suggest a self-calibration circuit. In response, the examiner points out that this shortcoming is cured by the compensation of Doluca's teaching, which the applicant did not argued about.

> Harchi Phan HAI PHAM